Single Bench

1 (5)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 6008 / 2006

PETITIONER :**Liverchand Temhre**
S/o Mandraj Temhre
Aged about 45 years,
Post- Phone Mechanic
R/o- LIG, Qt. No- 16, Near Laxmi Nagar
Dauda Colony, Pachpadi Naka
Raipur (C.G)

P.R. No. 6040/06
Presented by Shri K.S. Ahluwalia
dated 2-11-06
(11-50 a.m.)

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1. Union of India
Through Secretary
Ministry of Telecommunication
BSNL Office, 10th Floor, Statesman House,
B-148, Barakhamba Road,
New Delhi- 01

2. Chief General Manager
Chattisgarh Telecom Circle, BSNL
Khamardih, Vidhansabha Road,
Raipur (C.G)

3. Dy. General Manager
(Admn. & Examination Coordinator))
Chattisgarh Telecom Circle, BSNL
Khamardih, Vidhansabha Road,
Raipur (C.G)

4. Asst. General Manager (H.R.D.)
Office of- C.G.M.T., C.G. Circle
Raipur (C.G)

R/C
Clerk
21/11/06

THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Asst. Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
30/10/06
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

2 (6)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT ORDER OF DIRECTION TO DO JUSTICE IN THE MATTER.

(35)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. (C) No. 6008 of 2006

Petitioner : Liverchand Temhre

Versus

Respondent : Union of India & others

Shri G. S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Bhishma Kinger, Standing Counsel for the Union of India/Respondent No.1.

Shri V. V. S. Moorthy, Senior Advocate with Shri Bhishma Kinger, Advocate for the respondents No. 2 to 4.

O R D E R

(6th November, 2006)

1. According to the petitioner, he was working as Phone Mechanic in Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL) circle Raipur. The petitioner appeared in the departmental competitive examination for promotion to the post of Telecom Technical Assistant against 40% quota reserved for promotional candidates.
2. Shri Moorthy, learned Senior counsel and Shri Kinger, learned counsel appearing for the respondents submit that the petitioner has been declared as 'unfit' on the basis of marks obtained by him.
3. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking a direction against the respondents for revaluation of the answer sheets. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner categorically admits that there is no provision for revaluation or retotaling of the answer sheets of the

(36)

examination, however, the petitioner seeks sympathetic consideration of the Court.

4. It is well settled that in absence of any statutory provision, revaluation or retotaling of the answer sheets cannot be granted.

5. For the reasons stated above, this petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur